

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS 1.0. Box 150 Alexandrial Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspb.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/684,490	10/04/2000	David C. Gelvin	SENS.P010	3128
33717 CDEENIDED C	7590 05/07/2007 TDAIIDIC II D	EXAMINER		
GREENBERG TRAURIG LLP 2450 COLORADO AVENUE, SUITE 400E			JACOBS, LASHONDA T	
SANTA MONICA, CA 90404			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2157	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/07/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

 $\vec{x}^i \subseteq \bar{\gamma}$ 

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/684,490	GELVIN ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
LaShonda T. Jacobs	2157	

Bororo tiro i iling or air rippoar Brior	Examiner	Art Unit					
	LaShonda T. Jacobs	2157	,				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
THE REPLY FILED <u>04 April 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP 1.   The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.					
this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff dice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mu	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	rce, which FR 41.31; or (3)				
<ul> <li>a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.</li> <li>b) Z The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.</li> </ul>							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date	06.07(f).						
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da ).	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi te of the final rejection, o	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as even if timely filed,				
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed.</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th					
AMENDMENTS  3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because  (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);							
<ul> <li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or</li> <li>(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a</li> </ul>			the issues for				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			(DTO) 00 ()				
<ul> <li>4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1</li> <li>5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li> </ul>		impliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		II be entered and an e	explanation of				
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-9,12-15,17,22-67,69-74 and 76-85</u> .							
Claim(s) rejected. 1-9, 12-13, 11, 22-07, 09-14 and 10-03.  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 10-11, 16, 18-21,  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	68 and 75.						
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(	ils to provide a 1).				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•					
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered by <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>		n condition for allowa	nce because:				
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argue that Lu does not teach a real-time interface processor (RTIP) and an application processor, wherein the "RTIP performs real-time operations" and the "application processor performs high level processing functions. Also Applicant states that the at least one RTIP is coupled between the at least one interface port and the at least one application processor. However, the Examiner disagrees. Lu teaches a cellular private branch exchange for facilitating cellular communication for a first plurality of mobile station units in which includes a real-time processor coupled to a TDM bus and VM bus to perform protocol processing. The DSP section in Lu teaches the gateway node which includes a real-time processor and an application processor (DSP 559). According to Applicant claim language the gateway node includes at least one interface port, at least one real-time processor and at least one application processor, therefore Lu DSP section meet applicant 's claim language. By giving the broadest intpretaion of Applicant's caim language, Lu does teach a real-time interface processor and an application processor, wherein the RTIP performs real-time operations and the application processor performs high level processing functions in which the RTIO is coupled between the at least one interface port and at least one application processor.

ARIO ETIENNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER